

THE REMARKS

Claims 1-22, 24, and 28-30 are pending in the application and subject to examination.

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the Examiner Interview on June 16, 2009.

The Amendments to the Specification

The Abstract has been amended as requested by the Examiner.

In addition, the list of related applications has been updated to include the patent numbers of those application that to date have issued as patents, and also to include a provisional application that was included in the Preliminary Amendment submitted 3-30-04 but inadvertently dropped from that section in the Response to Office Action submitted 11-09-07.

The Claim Amendments

Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the processor readable medium is physical. This amendment is supported by, for example, page 7, lines 13-14. It is respectfully submitted that this amendment overcomes the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. §101 set forth on pages 2-3 of the Office Action.

Claim 1 has further been amended to remove details that are not believed necessary for patentability, to refocus the claim on the elements of the recited data structure, and also to recite that "at least one command in the sequence implements a packet modification operation that uses at least one of the one or more data or mask items to modify a packet." This amendment is supported, for example, by page 31, lines 13-14, page 33, lines 27-30, page 34, lines 17-18, page 35, lines 25-26, 29-30, page 36, lines 3-4, 7-8.

Claims 2-3 have been amended to restore these claims to their original form.

Claims 7-8 are amended to clarify the processor from which on-chip or off-chip status is determined.

Claim 11 has been amended to remove details that are not believed necessary for patentability, and also to recite that "at least one of the one or more commands retrieved from the first memory area implements a packet modification operation that uses at least one of the one or more data or mask items to modify the packet." This amendment is supported, for example, by

page 31, lines 13-14, page 33, lines 27-30, page 34, lines 17-18, page 35, lines 25-26, 29-30, page 36, lines 3-4, 7-8.

Claims 12-13 have been amended to recite details regarding the association between the packet and the data structure link, and the manner in which it this association may be implemented through a data structure index inserted into a packet header. These amendments are supported, for example, by page 30, lines 16-18.

Claims 14-15 have been amended to restore these claims to their original form as filed.

Claims 16-20 have been amended to change their dependency from claim 12 to claim 11, and claims 19-20 have also been amended to clarify the processor from which on-chip or off-chip status is determined.

Claim 24 has been amended to remove details that are not believed necessary for patentability, and also to recite “wherein at least one of the one or more commands implements a packet modification operation that uses at least one of the one or more data or mask items to modify a packet.” This amendment is supported, for example, by page 31, lines 13-14, page 33, lines 27-30, page 34, lines 17-18, page 35, lines 25-26, 29-30, page 36, lines 3-4, 7-8.

Claims 28-30 are new. Claims 28-29 are counterparts to claims 2-3, 14-15.

Claim 30 is supported, for example, by page 29, lines 24-28.

No new matter is introduced in any of the above amendments.

Claim Objections

Claim 11 has been amended to overcome the objection noted at page 2 of the Office Action.

35 U.S.C. § 101 Rejection

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101.

In response, claim 1 has been amended to recite that the processor readable medium is “physical.”

Applicant respectfully submits that this amendment overcomes the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection.

Claims 2-10 depend directly or indirectly from amended claims 1. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-10 are allowable at least because they depend from an allowable base claim.

35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejection

Claims 1, 8, 11 and 20 have been amended to correct the informalities noted on page 4 of the Office Action.

Applicant respectfully submits that these amendments overcomes the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejection.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication in the Office Action of allowable and allowed subject matter. Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments herein overcome the 35 U.S.C. §§101, 112 rejections and also retain all limitations necessary for patentability and therefore that all claims are now allowable.

CONCLUSION

For all the foregoing reasons, Applicant believes that the application is now in good and proper condition for allowance. Early notification thereof is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 23, 2009

/Robert C. Laurenson/

Robert C. Laurenson
Reg No. 34,206

HOWREY LLP
2941 Fairview Park Drive, Box 7
Falls Church, VA 22042
Tel: (650) 798-3548
Fax: (650) 798-3600